REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-identified application are

respectfully requested. Claims 1-24 are pending. Upon entry of this Amendment, the

specification has been amended to correct typographical errors, and claims 1 and 15

have been amended. Applicant notes with appreciation the allowance of claims 1-14

and 18-24.

Drawings

Applicant respectfully requests acknowledgement of the acceptance of the

drawings filed with application.

Priority

The Office Action erroneously indicates that the certified copy of the Korean

Patent Application Serial No. 2003-25429 was not filed. Applicant respectfully

submits that it was filed concurrently with the application as evidenced by the

attached copies of the date stamped post card and title page of the certified document.

Claims Objections

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 1-5 because of

informalities. Claim 1 has been amended to define "N" and "M" to overcome the

objections of claims 1-5.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and §103(a)

Claims 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated

by U.S. Patent No. 6,993,357 to Ito et al. Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C.

§103(a) as being unpatentable over Ito et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,377,818 to

Irube et al.

-10-

Appl. No. 10/807,298

Amdt. Dated January 19, 2007

Reply to Office Action of October 19, 2006

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that Ito et al. fails to teach a

Radio Frequency (RF) switch for separating a received signal into communication

services, and diplexers associated with the communication services for separating a

signal received from the RF switch into a call signal and a TV signal. Likewise, <u>Irube</u>

et al. does not supply at least the above-noted deficiencies of Ito et al. Claim 15 has

been amended to include separating a received signal into a corresponding

communication service using a RF switch and separating the communication service

using diplexers.

In view of the above proposed amendments, the rejection to claim 15 should

be withdrawn. The rejection of dependent claims 16 and 17, which incorporate the

limitations of base claim 15, should also be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the above, it is believed that the above-identified application is in

condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested. Should the

Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned

at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Stacey J. Longanecker

Attorney for Applicant

Reg. No. 33,952

Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P.

1300 19th Street, N.W., Suite 600

Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 659-9076

Dated: \amuan\lambda, 2007

-11-